REMARKS

Claims 1 and 3-7 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by Battat. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The present invention relates to a communications network panning system and method for creating communications network diagrams. Figure 1 shows an overview 100, displayed on a graphical user interface of a communications planning system, of subnetworks 101-107 within a communications network. Overview 100 incorporates selectors 111-117 for selecting a graphical representation of each of the subnetworks 101-107. The selectors 111-117 are implemented, for example, using a hyperlink technique, so that the graphical representation of the corresponding subnetwork can be called up by selecting a text or graphic element assigned to the hyperlink. Similarly, subnetworks 101-1907 incorporate selectors 121-125 and 131-135 for selecting a combined graphical representation for subnetworks which are linked to each other, showing an extract of each in the region of a subnetwork interface. By selecting a graphic element assigned to the relevant selector 121-125, 131-135, the desired combined graphical representation of a subnetwork interface can be called up.

Battat discloses a network management system that allows a network administrator to manage all components of a heterogeneous networked computer system using views of any component or any set of components. Specifically, the Examiner cites Figure 5 as disclosing the "second selector for selection a combined graphical representation of an extract of each sub network for interlinked sub networks" limitation of claim 1. Although not entirely clear, presumably the Examiner is referring to the ability to "select first object from list of visible objects" 501 and "select next object from list of visible objects" 506 as disclosing this feature. The Examiner then cites Figure 11 as disclosing the "in a region of a sub-network interface, which includes ... and details of the links, which exist between the node types" limitation of claim 1. Applicants respectfully disagree.

The corresponding disclosure of Figure 5, at col. 9, lns. 19-37, discusses adjusting models to reflect a change in position using modules 501 and 506 to handle the iteration through the list of visible objects, selecting each object to be rendered. The corresponding description of Figure 11 discloses, at col. 14, lns. 26-36, an Intelligent Aggregated Status Display. The system indicates the status of objects by use of colored indicator lights, and may be aggregated so that network segments, subnetworks, buildings and cities reflect the status of what is in them. However, there is no correlation between the selected objects in Figure 5 and the aggregation status display in Figure 11. That is, the two elements operate independently. Figure 5 is an elaboration of numeral 203 "Adjust Model to New Position" in

Figure 2, such that an object can be selected from a list of objects in order to be rendered. Figure 11, on the other hand, speaks only to aggregating a status of objects by using colored indicator lights. There is no correlation between the two. In the claimed invention, however, the second selector provides a combined graphical representation of an extract of each subnetwork of interlinked subnetworks, and provides a hierarchically structured detail of the node types in the region of the subnetwork interface, and details of the links there-between. That is, by virtue of selecting the combined graphical representation (i.e. second selector), detailed information is provided regarding the structure and link between the subnetworks. Hence, Battat fails to disclose "a second selector for selecting a combined graphical representation of an extract of each subnetwork for interlinked subnetworks, in a region of a subnetwork interface, which includes hierarchically structured details of the node types present in the region of the subnetwork interface concerned, and details of the links which exist between the node types," as required by the claimed invention.

Since the recited structure and method are not disclosed by the applied prior art, claims 1 and 3-7 are patentable.

Claim 2 has been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Battat in view of Bowman-Amuah. The rejection is respectfully traversed for the same reasons presented in the arguments above.

In view of the above, Applicants submit that this application is in condition for allowance. An indication of the same is solicited. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge deposit account 02-1818 for any fees which are due and owing, referencing Attorney Docket No. 118744-102.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLP

BY

Kevin R. Spivak
Reg. No. 43,148
Customer No. 29177

Dated: November 7, 2007